

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/303,979	PEARCE, TONY M.
	Examiner Mark Eashoo, Ph.D.	Art Unit 1732

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Mark Eashoo, Ph.D. (3) _____.

(2) Daniel McCarthy. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 22 May 2001.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.

If Yes, brief description:

Claim(s) discussed: 21-32.

Identification of prior art discussed: *that cited*.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Ex. Eashoo called Mr. McCarthy regarding an Exr. Amdt. required to correct formal matters. Mr. McCarthy approved the amendment.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview(if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/303,979	PEARCE, TONY M.
	Examiner Mark Eashoo, Ph.D.	Art Unit 1732

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Mark Eashoo, Ph.D. (3) _____
 (2) Daniel McCarthy. (4) _____

Date of Interview: 08 May 2001.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
 c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.

If Yes, brief description:

Claim(s) discussed: 21-32.

Identification of prior art discussed: *that cited*.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Ex. Eashoo noted that a new abstract and a brief description of drawings 43-97 were needed. Mr. McCarthy said he would file the changes in a supplemental response.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview(if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

 Examiner's signature, if required